

File



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,684	12/22/2000	Sridhar Iyengar	42390P10467	1658

8791 7590 08/11/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

GOLD, AVI M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/746,684	IYENGAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Avi Gold	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the amendment filed on June 12, 2006. Claims 1, 7, 10, 18, and 26 were amended. Claims 1-26 are pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,484,011, further in view of Brooks et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,069,573.

Thompson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an annunciator display device which is always on and which can wirelessly receive information to be display (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Thompson teaches a method utilizing for a handheld device associated with a viewing device operable to receive a broadcast, comprising:

receiving by the handheld device a content catalog, said catalog varying based at least in part on the broadcast and identifying interactive content associated with the

broadcast provided by a content provider (col. 1, lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-25, col. 6, lines 10-17, Thompson discloses a wireless display device receiving a content catalog by means of a broadcast, with some content being interactive);

selecting by the handheld device content in the content catalog (col. 6, lines 10-17, Thompson discloses pressing an arrow key on the device to choose content).

Thompson fails to teach the limitation further including content in a first data format incompatible with the handheld device, identifying content selection to a formatting agent, and receiving said selected content from the formatting agent in a second data format compatible with the handheld device.

However, Brooks teaches a personal broadcasting and viewing method of audio and video data using a wide area network (see abstract). Brooks teaches the use a device receiving data in only one format and determining a processing program for the selected format and converting that data to the proper format (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Thompson in view of Brooks to have content in a first data format incompatible with the handheld device, identify content selection to a formatting agent, and receive said selected content from the formatting agent in a second data format compatible with the handheld device. One would be motivated to do so because it allows the user to view all of the available content on their device.

Regarding claim 2, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 1, wherein the handheld device comprises a wireless coupling to the formatting agent (col. 3, lines 1-5, Brooks discloses a mobile client device wirelessly connected to the web server which does the converting).

Regarding claim 3, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 1, wherein the content catalog content corresponding at least in part to broadcasts available for receipt by the viewing device (col. 1, lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson).

Regarding claim 4, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 1, further comprising:

broadcasting the broadcast to the viewing device over a communication channel;  
determining broadcast-related data for the broadcast; and  
making said broadcast-related data available to a content initiator so that the content initiator associates said broadcast related data with the content catalog (col. 1, lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson).

Regarding claim 5, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 4, further comprising:

providing, by a broadcaster, said broadcast-related data to a content provider so that the content provider makes said broadcast-related data available to the content initiator (col. 1, lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson).

Regarding claim 6, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 1, wherein the first data format is incompatible with the handheld device, the method further comprising:

retrieving said selected content from the content provider (col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson);

converting by the formatting agent of the first data format into the second data format (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5);

Regarding claim 8, Thompson teaches a method for a handheld device to facilitate interaction with a viewing device receiving a broadcast, comprising:

indicating with the handheld device interest in obtaining a content catalog having a portion identifying interactive content associated with the broadcast (col. 1, lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-25, col. 6, lines 10-17);

receiving the content (col. 3, lines 14-25);

selecting content in the content catalog (col. 6, lines 10-17);

Thompson fails to teach the limitation further including content in a first data format incompatible with the handheld device, identifying content selection to a formatting agent, receiving said selected content from the formatting agent in a second data format compatible with the handheld device; wherein said converting to the second data format comprises: determining characteristics of the handheld device, identifying a portion of said selected content that is incompatible with the handheld device, and

wherein said receiving said selected content from in the second data format includes converting said incompatible portion into a compatible portion based on said determined characteristics.

However, Brooks teaches the use a device receiving data in only one format and determining a processing program for the selected format and converting that data to the proper format (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Thompson in view of Brooks to have content in a first data format incompatible with the handheld device, identify content selection to a formatting agent, receive said selected content from the formatting agent in a second data format compatible with the handheld device; wherein said converting to the second data format comprises: determine characteristics of the handheld device, identify a portion of said selected content that is incompatible with the handheld device, and wherein said receiving said selected content from in the second data format includes converting said incompatible portion into a compatible portion based on said determined characteristics. One would be motivated to do so because it allows the user to view all of the available content on their device.

Regarding claim 9, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 8, wherein said incompatible portion comprises an Internet communication protocol (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5, Brooks).

Regarding claim 10, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 1, wherein the content catalog comprises one or more of: links to content provider content, and embedded content provider content (col. 3, lines 14-25, col. 6, lines 10-17, Thompson).

Regarding claim 19, Thompson and Brooks teach the system of claim 18, wherein the first data format is the same as the second format (col. 2, lines 57-67, Brooks discloses that some mobile devices are able to receive a plurality of formats).

Regarding claim 20, Thompson and Brooks teach the system of claim 18, wherein said second instructions include further instructions for converting the first data format into the second data format (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5, Brooks).

Regarding claim 21, Thompson and Brooks teach the system of claim 18, further comprising:

a content provider communicatively coupled to the formatting server ();

wherein said first instructions include further instructions, which when executed by the handheld device, direct the handheld device to retrieve content from the content provider (col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson).

Regarding claim 22, Thompson and Brooks teach the system of claim 21, wherein said instructions include further instructions, which when executed by the handheld device, direct the handheld device to:



display the catalog on the handheld device;  
receive a selection of a catalog entry corresponding to content provided by a  
content provider; and  
retrieve said content from the content provider (col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson).

Regarding claim 23, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 1, wherein  
the content identified in the content catalog changes in accord with changes of material  
present in the broadcast (col. 1, lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-25, Thompson).

Regarding claim 24, Thompson teaches a method for a handheld device to  
facilitate interaction with a viewing device receiving a broadcast, comprising:

indicating with the handheld device interest in obtaining a content catalog  
containing at least one transitory selectable item associated with the broadcast (col. 1,  
lines 19-22, col. 3, lines 14-37, Thompson discloses an interactive TV ad);

receiving the content catalog (col. 3, lines 14-25);

selecting content in the content catalog (col. 6, lines 10-17).

Thompson fails to teach the limitation further including a transitory selectable  
item comprising content in a first data format that is incompatible with the handheld  
device, identifying content selection to a formatting agent, and receiving said selected  
content from the formatting agent in a second data format compatible with the handheld  
device.

However, Brooks teaches the use a device receiving data in only one format and determining a processing program for the selected format and converting that data to the proper format (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Thompson in view of Brooks to have a transitory selectable item that comprises content in a first data format that is incompatible with the handheld device, identify content selection to a formatting agent, and receive said selected content from the formatting agent in a second data format compatible with the handheld device. One would be motivated to do so because it allows the user to view all of the available content on their device.

Regarding claim 25, Thompson and Brooks teach the method of claim 24, wherein the formatting agent is disposed within the viewing device (col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 5, Brooks).

Claims 7, 11-18, and 26 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1, 4-6, and 8 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,574,660 to Pashupathy et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,795 to Malkin et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,405 to Stewart et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,715 to Langseth et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,166,778 to Yamamoto et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,567,660 to Wegener et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,455 to Logan et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,412,112 to Barrett et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,587,835 to Treyz et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,047 to Chandra et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,318 to Hawkins et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,331,865 to Sachs et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,154,772 to Dunn et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avi Gold whose telephone number is 571-272-4002.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100